

1911.18

Scott

Papers

Reciprocity's Benefit to Western Canada

SOME UNITED STATES VIEWS.

Herewith are presented an assortment of views by United States public men upon the reciprocity agreement which are commended to those (if there be any such) who think that the opening of the United States markets would not benefit the producers of Western Canada. They have been compiled from the Congressional Record; and are to be regarded simply as samples. A large volume could easily be filled with similar declarations:

Canada Will Capture Butter and Cheese Market.

(Congressman Arthur W. Kopp, of Wisconsin, April 12.)

"If this agreement is adopted it will destroy these great industries (butter and cheese). It is said that he is a coward who will turn back when first he discovers that he is wrong. We are likewise cowards if we perpetrate this injustice upon a great industry of our country, an injustice so great that it will paralyze the industry."

The Canadian West a Land of Wonderful Potentialities.

(Senator McCumber, North Dakota, June 14.)

"It is difficult to impress the minds of those who have not had the opportunity to visit this land of wonderful potentiality with either its territorial extent or its productive capacity."

Want the Tariff Bars Kept Up.

(Congressman Sloan, Nebraska, April 19.)

"The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Crumpacker) said that it was unfortunate that some must live close to the Canadian border. That is true; and we cannot widen that line in terms of miles, but we can widen it in terms of money. If we cannot say that it shall be 500 miles wide, we can say that it shall be 10 to 25 cents per bushel wide."

Canada Will Capture United States Barley Market.

(Senator McCumber, North Dakota, June 14.)

"The average barley yield in Canada is 30 bushels. If it costs \$8 to produce an acre of barley, it costs 27 cents a bushel in Canada. The yield in the United States is 25 bushels, and the cost per bushel 32 cents, or 5 cents

more per bushel than in Canada. With the tariff removed, Canada could easily supply the entire barley market of the United States."

They Fear the Greater Canada.

(Congressman George W. Fairchild, New York, April 18.)

"Last year, without reciprocity, a great many farmers went from the Western States to take advantage of the low-priced virgin land offered to settlers. What the result will be when our market of 90,000,000 of people is opened, without any restriction whatever, to the great undeveloped farming resources of Canada remains to be seen. It is not what Canada is today that we need fear, as much as what Canada will be when she is in possession of our markets and is able to offer them freely to immigrants."

Will Mean Prosperity for Canada.

(Ex-Speaker Cannon, April 19.)

"Notwithstanding all this, the Democratic party, with their enormous majority in the House, will pass this miscalled reciprocity bill, which will result in prosperity for our Canadian neighbors and bankruptcy for those engaged in agriculture in the United States."

Canadian Railways Must Reduce Rates.

(Mr. Moore, Pennsylvania; Debate in the House of Representatives, April 17.)

"My question is pertinent to the question the gentleman is now considering. I want to ask if the railroads of this country would do a greater business by reason of the increased amount of freight that would come to them from the Canadian market?"

Mr. Crumpacker (Indiana):

"It would increase some. It would

compel the Canadian railroads and the Canadian ship lines to reduce rates, and take care of their own products or lose the business, and the result would be higher prices in Winnipeg and that part of Canada."

Fears a Johnstown Flood of Canadian Wheat.

(Senator McCumber, North Dakota, June 14.)

"The President of the United States does not comprehend the enormous possibilities of this Canadian country. These possibilities have not been brought home to him. It is evident from his remarks that he fears a stringency in food supplies. If he could fully understand the size, the capacity, of this Canadian reservoir, with which he hopes to prevent a lack of food supply, I am certain that his fears would vanish. I am certain that if he knew that this great empire in a few years, if necessity required, could raise more wheat than the whole world now produces, he would be more fearful of a Johnstown flood than of a drought."

Will Increase Price of Canadian Lands.

(Senator McCumber, North Dakota, June 14.)

"The price of land in Richland county in my state (North Dakota) is at least twice the average price of land in Saskatchewan. If our land, therefore, costs \$40 per acre and produces 15 bushels of wheat per acre, worth 80 cents a bushel, we would receive a gross return of \$12 per acre. If the Canadian farmer's land costs \$20 per acre and produces 20 bushels per acre, worth 80 cents per bushel, he would receive a gross return of \$16 per acre. Or course, Mr. President, the value of the lands close to the border do not show this difference, but taking the two great sections, the difference at the present time is very considerable. It stands to reason that as soon as the duty is removed this difference will grow less."

Canadian Lands to be Greatly Increased in Value.

(Congressman Sloan, Nebraska, April 19.)

"Now, what is going to happen? If this treaty is made effective it will open up millions of acres of rich, fertile and cheap lands in the Canadian Northwest, already proving very attractive, as is shown by the hundreds of thousands of people who have gone from the United States and settled on these lands, and to me it seems certain we must pass through another period of depression like unto that which existed east of the Mississippi river, while the farm lands of the west

Takes Off His Hat to Fielding and Paterson.

(Congressman Mondell, Wisconsin, April 20.)

"I take off my hat to the gentlemen who, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, negotiated this treaty. No longer may the Yankee pride himself on being the great trader of the world. I commend to him our Canadian cousin. Those gentlemen knew the trade and industries of their country, and they drew an agreement every line of which gave them the advantage of the wonderful markets of the most wonderful country on earth in exchange for seeming advantages in the markets of a land where, in spite of all preferential tariffs against us, we now practically control all the markets worth while."

Wheat Prices Higher in the United States.

(Congressman Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan, April 17.)

"That wheat is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States no intelligent man will dispute. Some argument has been made here that the price of wheat on both sides of the line does not vary much, if any. But the gentleman making that argument forgets that the grade of wheat mentioned or the price of wheat in the various markets is based upon the value and grade of the wheat. All grades of wheat are not of the same value. So that when the price of wheat is stated to be the same in Canada as in the Dakotas and Minnesota or at Minneapolis and St. Paul markets, you may mark down in your memorandum books that it is not the same grade of wheat, because there is a difference in the value in our markets for the various grades of wheat."

Canadian Land Prices Will Go Up.

(From Debate in the House of Representatives, April 17.)

Mr. Hughes, of New Jersey: "Can the gentleman explain to us why it is that the Canadian farmer's land is worth so much more and sells for so much less?"

A member: "Produces so much more."

Mr. Lenroot, Wisconsin: "I do not quite get the gentleman's question."

Mr. Carlin: "His question is, Why when it produces so much more, it sells for so much less?"

Mr. Lenroot: "Because they have not the advantage of our markets; and you propose to give them that advantage, and when you do, the price of their land will be the same."

Higher Prices on the United States Side.

(Congressman Lenroot, Wisconsin, April 17.)

"The prices of agricultural products are much higher in the United States than in Canada.

"According to the report of the tariff board, the average price of spring wheat received by the farmer of Canada in 1910 was 73.8 cents per bushel, while our farmers received 89.8 cents per bushel, or 16 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer received. According to the report of the tariff board, for his barley the Canadian farmer received 47.4 cents, while our farmers averaged 67.8 cents per bushel, or 10.4 cents more per bushel than the Canadian farmer. For his flax seed the Canadian farmer received \$2.07 per bushel, while our farmers received \$2.20 per bushel, or 23 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer.

"For his hay—and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Peters) is in the chamber—the Canadian farmers received \$2.30 per bushel, or 23 farmers received \$12.26 per ton, or \$2.60 per ton more than the Canadian farmer."

Canada Realizes Advantages.

(Congressman Charles E. Pickett, Iowa, April 18.)

"No one has yet reconciled this argument with the difference in price that obtains in towns along the Canadian border. Take Portal, N. D., and North Portal, Canada, a street dividing the two, where, as the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Hanna) has pointed out, there is a marked difference in the price of wheat, barley, flax and other products raised in the same community, on the same soil, with the same transportation facilities—just a narrow strip of 30 feet dividing the two. The farmers of this country know the difference between a home market for the substantial part of their products and shipping them to the sea coast and then 3,000 miles across the sea to be sold to the underpaid labor of London and Liverpool. Canada knows the same thing. If not, why has she been knocking at our door for half a century to get into our markets? She realizes their value, even if some of the gentlemen on this floor do not."

Will Encourage Canadian Development.

(Congressman Mondell, Wyoming, April 20.)

"There is an objection to this agreement which appeals very strongly to the people of the Intermountain States who are desirous of seeing their country settled and developed. For a number of years past there has been a strong tide of immigration from the

United States into the Canadian northwest, mostly of substantial farmers and business men of some means, the very class we need the most for the settlement and development of our region. These people have been passing through our territory by the thousands, lured to Canada by extensive advertisement, setting forth the liberality of Canadian land laws compared with ours and therefore the better opportunity of securing a home and a farm cheaply. This agreement, providing, as it does, that the immigrant to the Canadian northwest shall enjoy additional advantages by having free access to our markets for his produce and his live stock, will tend to further encourage and increase the settlement of Canada by American farmers, thus retarding and delaying the settlement and development of our own Intermountain States."

A Tidal Wave of Immigration Into Canada.

(Congressman James M. Gudger, in the House of Representatives, May 18.)

"During the last eight years over 500,000 American farmers moved into her borders, carrying with them over \$1,000,000,000 in money, and this movement year by year is spreading and gathering momentum. On one train alone crossing into Canada settlers in the Western States carried in with them \$225,000 in cash. Adopt this agreement and a tidal wave of emigration will sweep this country in a mad rush for Canadian homes, depleting our farms; losing our best citizenship, combined with a continued injury beyond human estimation—the loss and injury sustained by this exodus of our best farmers is not comparable with wars and pestilence."

A Good Boost for Western Canadian Farms.

(Senator M. Crawford, South Dakota, in the U. S. Senate, May 17.)

"I say the farmer in Iowa who owns 160 acres of land worth \$100 per acre could sell it; take the \$16,000, and buy 800 acres of land in Alberta—just five times the quantity he had before—each acre of which will yield more wheat, oats, barley, or flaxseed than an acre of Iowa land, or of Wisconsin, Minnesota, or Dakota land, as the case may be. Is it not perfectly plain that the result will be a depression in the values of Iowa, Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin land and a great boom for the Canadian farmer at the expense of the American farmer?"

North Dakota Farmers Alarmed.

The opinion of the farmers of North Dakota as to the effect of reciprocity on Canada was very clearly and forcibly

bly set forth at the big anti-reciprocity convention held at Grand Forks, N.D., on April 4 and 5, 1911. Every section of the state was represented. A large number of resolutions were unanimously adopted, among them being:

"4—That it places our farmers in the position of competing in our own home markets with an alien people, upon conditions most advantageous to our competitors.

"5—That the Canadian producer, with his cheaper land, requires smaller investment, while his new, virgin soil returns greater yields with cheaper tillage, making the per bushel cost of his product much less than ours.

"6—That it "blazes the way" for the emigration of thousands of our people, and millions of our wealth to a foreign field.

"7—That it will reduce farm values, increasing the burden of the debtor, destroy incentive for the greater development of farm production, and lure to alien benefit untold millions of our wealth that should and would accrue to this and future generations if employed in the development of those vast, untilled acres that lie between the Mississippi river and the Pacific within our own borders."

From the speech of J. M. Devine, one of the chief anti-reciprocity speakers, is quoted this passage:

"McKinley did hint reciprocity, but when he said it, he said it of countries that produce things that could not be produced by our climatic conditions and that we need; and things which we can produce by reason of our climatic conditions that they cannot produce and that they need. So tear down the wall of protection and let the South American products come in free which we cannot produce. Let our meats, flour and other things go to South America which they cannot produce. You can't have reciprocity with a country producing exactly the same things that you produce and producing more than they consume, of the same things that you produce more than you consume. It cannot be done. If you try it, this will happen. That the country that can produce the most of it for the least energy and effort and expense will take the market of the other country that must by reason of conditions of living, taxations, etc., cost more to produce the same things. If you had two lakes or bodies of water separated by an artificial or natural barrier, one higher than the other or lower, as the case may be, you remove that barrier and the waters will merge, and one is going to be infinitely lower than it was before and the other will be much higher. In this reciprocity pact the government of the United

States will bear the brunt of the lower level and Canada will have the delight and privilege of the higher level. You cannot get away from it. We trade this great home market, the greatest market on earth, infinitely greater and bigger and better than all the markets of Europe combined. As the speaker that preceded me said, Canada today has cultivated but one-twelfth of its land. The Peace river valley which he spoke of has 65,000,000 acres of oats, wheat, flax and barley land and the best meadow land and pastures on the American continent, and that's only a small spot of this great Canada. Pass this great reciprocity pact and Canada within twenty years under the law of ease of profit, under the law of its growth, will produce all the wheat that the American continent can consume, and she will do it. And her flax and barley and oats and stock and butter and eggs will follow in exact proportions."

The convention concluded by adopting a strong memorial to President Taft adverse to the reciprocity agreement which sets forth in part:

"We desire to call your attention to the phenomenal increase in small grain production in the northwestern Canadian provinces. For illustration, Saskatchewan in the past eleven years, with only twelve per cent. of her tillable acres under cultivation at the present time, has increased her wheat production from 4,780,000 bushels to 90,215,000 bushels; oats from 1,500,000 bushels to 105,500,000 bushels; barley, 182,000 to 7,750,000 bushels; flax, no bushels to 4,448,000 bushels.

"Canada under reciprocity could continue this rapid increase of grain production so that in twenty years she could produce more than the consuming capacity of the entire American continent.

"We ask, should the American farmer, who has helped to build up a home market, be compelled to compete in the world's market with a country showing such rapid increase in grain production, when the figures clearly show that our home market has justified and paid an excess of approximately eight cents per bushel to the American farmer, over the world's market for wheat alone, and on a crop of approximately 700,000,000 bushels, with the per cent. per bushel even greater on flax and barley?

"Can you, as president of the whole people of the United States, justify the surrender of this, the world's best and greatest market for the doubtful possibility of the lessened cost on food products to the American consumer, or the possible increased fields for the American manufacturer?"

